

REMARKS

This action is responsive to the Office Action mailed on July 1, 2005. In that action: claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite; claims 12 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 for containing limitations without sufficient antecedent basis; claims 1-3, 9, 12-13, 16, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Dickey et al. (USPN 5,821,405); claims 4-7, 10-11, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dickey; and claims 8, 14, 15, 19, and 20 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were noted as allowable if amended to not depend on a rejected claim.

Regarding the objections to claims 8, 14, 15, 19, and 20, claim 1 has been amended to include substantially the limitations of claims 2 and 8, which have been canceled. Claims 3 and 6 have been amended to depend on claim 1. Claim 13 has been amended to include substantially the limitations of claim 14, which has been canceled. Claims 15, 19, and 20 are believed to be allowable because they depend on claim 13 which is allowable as amended.

Regarding the rejections of claims 3, 12, and 18 based on 35 U.S.C. 112, claim 3 has been amended to remove the language that indicates a list of inclusions in operation information. The limitation “interchangeable sensor” in Claim 12 is believed to have proper antecedent basis due to the revision of claim 1. Claim 18 has been amended to include “electrical component” to use the antecedent basis in claim 13.

Claims 21-23 have been added and are believed to be patentable as they include combinations of limitations that were indicated as allowable by the Examiner. Specifically, claim 21 includes substantially the limitations of original claims 13 and 15. Claim 22 includes

substantially the limitations of original claims 13, 18, and 20. Claim 23 includes substantially the limitations of original claims 13 and 19. Each of these combinations were indicated as allowable by the Examiner.

Additionally, claims 1 and 13 are believed to be patentable as they include combinations of limitations that were indicated as allowable by the Examiner. Specifically, claim 1 includes substantially the limitations of original claims 1, 2, and 8. Additionally, claim 13 includes substantially the limitations of original claims 13 and 14. Each of these combinations were indicated as allowable by the Examiner.

Based upon the foregoing, Applicant believes that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and such disposition is respectfully requested. In the event that a telephone conversation would further prosecution and/or expedite allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

MARSH FISCHMANN & BREYFOGLE LLP

By: 

Robert G. Crouch

Registration No. 34,806

3151 South Vaughn Way, Suite 411

Aurora, Colorado 80014

(720) 562-5506

Date: 12-23-05